6.

(6)

THE SCRIPTVRES PLEA FOR MAGISTRATES.

VVHEREIN

Is shewed the unlawfulnesse of resisting the lawfull MAGISTRATE, under colour of RELIGION.

ROM. 13. 2.

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the Ordinance of God: and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.

OXFORD,
Printed by *Leonard Lichfield*, 1643.

(109.)

THE SCRIPTURES PLEA FOR MAGISTRATES.

WHEREIN

Is shewed the unlawfulnesse of resisting the lawfull MAGISTRATE, under colour of RELIGION.

ROM. 13. 2.

Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.

OXFORD,
Printed by Leonard Lichfield, 1643.

(*11)

Of resisting the lawfull Magistrate upon colour of Religion.

IN this proposall of the point for debate, there are onely two words will need an account to be given of them: 1. What is meant by Resisting. 2. Why the word Colour is put in. For the first, Resisting here signifies violent, forcible, offensive resistance, fighting against, as *Hesychius* the best Scripture-glossary explaines it, (ἀντιτάσσεται & ἀντιπολεμεῖ all one, and ἀντιτασσόμενος ὁ εἰς δεύτερος ἐπὶ μαχῇ). and the Apostle in like manner, *Rom.* 13. 2. using ἀνθίστημι & ἀντιτάσσομαι promiscuously for the same, and so in other places, although it is true, it is used sometimes in a wider sence. But that will not here be materiall, when we here set downe before-hand what we meane by it. For the second, the word [colour] is in the Title added, onely for this reason, (not to prejudge the Religion, which is fought for, to be onely a colour, but) because it is possible for a man to fight for Religion, and yet not upon colour of Religion, to wit, in case the Religion for which he fights be established by the Law of the Land, for then his colour for fighting may be the preservation of Law, which the Magistrate is bound by oath to maintaine, and though he fight for Religion, yet it is under that other colour: whereas he that fights upon colour of Religion making that his onely pretence of fighting, is *ipso facto* supposed to fight for a Religion distant or contrary to that which is established by Law, and so all pretence or colour of Law excluded, yea, and all supposition nefailing in the Magistrate, understanding for the Law present, not against it; which I desire may be the setting of the case, to exclude the fallacy, *plurium interrogationum*, and to distinguish the quarrell of Religion from that other of Law, and so to meddle at this time onely with that which is fully within the Divines Spheare, and leave the other to some body else.

Those two termes being thus explained, and so the state of the question set, the lawfull Magistrate, and the established Law of the Kingdome on one side, and some person or persons inferiour to him, upon colour of Religion, *i.* for some Religion

not yet established by Law, on t'other side, that it should be lawfull to them to take up armes against him would seem not very reasonable, if he were but a private man, abstracted from Regall power, (which sure doth not make it more lawfull to resist him then any body else) having broken no established Law (as is supposed in the case) for what legall accusation can lie against him in a point wherein he hath not broken the Law? But then this will be more unreasonable, if moreover it be considered, that colour of Religion is so wide and unlimited a thing, that no man, that is never so much in the wrong in any opinion, but thinkes himselfe in the right (for otherwise he would not continue in that error) and so that colour will be plea equally good to all sorts of errours as well as truths: and besides, he that hath not so much Religion as to be in an errour, may yet have so much wit as to make use of that Apology for his sedition, (to wit, colour of Religion) and plead it as legally as the most zealous professor; and consequently, if that will serve turne, who ever shall but pretend to believe contrary to the Religion established in any Kingdome, shall be *ipso facto* absolved from all bond of Allegiance in *foro humano*, and if he will adventure the hazzard of the judgement to come, shall have no restraint layd on him by any earthly Tribunall; and so by this meanes already the grounds of the dissolution of any government are laid by this unsufferable principle, and the World given up to be ruled onely by the religion (which is in effect the will) of every man, whereas before, there was a peace as well in Church, Policy as well as Religion, a power in the Magistrates hand, bend at that in every mans owne breft or conscience; and yet more peaceably, & villaines & hypocrites as well as any else, for pretenders of Religion, (which is a faire ground would hold, were left unlimited. Wherefore if he be not spoiled that sufferes from that thus fallaciously pretends Religion, though by this discipline he escapes, yet shall surely pay for it hereafter; and that that is sufficient, he is right, in the other Court, but of that searcher of hearts, to whith the hypocrite can not appeale: I answer, that although that be true, yet is it not sufficient, because, although there be a judgement to come for all crimes, yet is it not hence inferred, that it is not necessary to have present judicatures also, not to leave all offenders to errors at such a distance, and indeed for the continuance of the peace of Communities to provide some violent restraint at the present for those whom those greater but future deterrents cannot sufficiently worke on. This everyman knowes is the originall of humane Lawes yea, and of Dominion it selfe, *a presumption* that all men will not doe their duties for love or feare of God, (it is apparent the Jewes would not under their Theocracy) and therefore for good mens sakes, and for peace sake, and for the maintaining of Communities, those superadditions have beene thought necessary, as some thornes in the hedge of Gods Law, that may pierce the hands and sides of him that shall attempt to breake over or thorough it. From whence the conclusion will be evident, that the Rules for the preserving of government must be such as shall have force to restraine the Atheist or the hypocrite as well as the good Christian (which sure will lesse need those restraints) or else they are meerly insufficient to the attaining of their end, to the preserving of government, peace, community, or protecting any that lives under it: which being supposed, it will also follow, that nothing must be indulged upon any colour of Religion,

(for if Religion there destroy, and consequently never subsume in it) which will open this gap or outlet to others, that may make the like use of it. For this will be directly destructive of the end of government (which is, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, 1 Tim. 2. 2.) yea, and of government it selfe.

This argument being thus prosecuted and cleared, might be sufficient to determine this whole businesse, were it not for one rejoynder which is ordinarily made, the force of which is taken from that supposall, that every man ought to have of his owne soule, and consequently of the maintaining of his Religion on which (to abstract from all possible disputes concerning the particular truth of it, he being perhaps not acute or artist enough to uphold it against all objections) he is fully convinced, the health and salvation of that wholly depends. For the maintaining of which being (of all the humane power in the World, if he may not take up Armes or doe any thing, he cannot see what can be fit for him to fight for, (nothing sure being more precious then soule) or consequently, why he may not take up that opinion of the Reverend Sea-Anabaptists, That it is not lawfull to fight at all, which if it should be settled in, although for the present it would produce peace, yet it would be little for the advantage of Magistracy in the issue. To this I shall answer, by conceiving of these foure things. 1. That Religion is to be every mans Supreme care. Aristotle, Jewell in his Cabinet. 2. That it cannot, at least in humane consideration, be expected that any man should be lesse carefull of his false Religion, (if he be really perswaded of the truth of it) then any other is of the true. May, 3. that if he do not use any lawfull meanes to defend that false (which he is convinced is the true) Religion; this is a sinne of like enormitie in him, though indeed through prepossession not to open his eyes to greater light and conviction of the truth offered to him, and perhaps thorough sluggishnesse not to seek after light, he yet a farre greater sinne in him. For though no man ought to doe any thing contrary to what he takes to be truth, yet ought he to take all meanes to suppose his error, not only when it doth, but also when it may appear to him to be so, and to seek to those helpes that may be instrumentall to that end. 4. That in some cases the use of Armes is not unlawfull. But these all this being thus granted, and so in effect that all lawfull meanes may be used for the maintaining of Religion, we must yet secondly deny the inference of the Objection; upon this onely ground, because though Armes may lawfully be used in some cases, and Religion be maintained by all lawfull meanes, yet Armes are not a lawfull meanes for this end, and so may not be used in this case, that is by Subjects against the lawfull Magistrate in case of Religion, at least when some other Religion is by Law established in that Kingdome. Which assertion I shall confirme onely by foure Arguments: 1. Taken from the nature of Religion. 2. From examples of Christ and Christians. 3. From the very making of Christianity, and particularly of the Protestant doctrine. 4. From the Constitution of Kingdomes, which being subordinate to the other three may deserve consideration, as far as it agrees with them.

1. From the nature of Religion, which is an act of the soule, which cannot be forced or constrained by outward violence, and therefore, 'tis apparant, needs no outward defence for the maintaining of it, much lesse, invasion of others. A man may be as truly religious under all the tyranny and slavery in the world, as in the most triumphant prosperous estate. They that have power to kill the bo-

dy,

dy, are not able to commit the least rape upon the soule, they may (the loss of my life, they cannot of my Religion; the weakest creeple in the Hospitall may defie the whole Armie of the Philistines in this matter. But you will aske, Is not the outward profession and publike exercise of Religion some part of it, and that to be thus maintained, where any attempt to hinder it? To which I answer, That the use of this, the outward Profession, can no more be hindred then the forme and act of the soul, but rather may be most illustrated in time of depression. I may confesse Christ in the dark of mine, in the furnace, on the rack, on the gridiron, and when my tongue is cut out, by patient, constant suffering in that cause. Religion is not so truly professed by endeavouring to kill others, as by being killed patiently our selves rather then we will renounce it. When I fight, it may be malice, revenge, some hope of gaine, or impunity at least by the pretence of service, any one of a hundred worldly interests that may help to whet my sword on me, or most slightly allow, I may kill and do be killed: and so all this while here is no act of confession of Christ in thus venturing my life, although I do affirme I do this for my Religion, because, though I so affirme, men are not bound to believe me, there being so much odds against me that I doe it for somewhat else. But when I lay down my life patiently, the direction of my Gods reigne up all my possible worldly interests for the securing of my one spirituall trust, this is to the eye of man a profession capable of no reasonable suspicion of insincerity, and indeed none so, but this.

As for the second, the publike exercise of the true Religion, it were by all men heartily to be wisht that it might be enjoyed at all times, for the advancing of Gods glory, increase of charity, conversion of others, &c. But if it may not be had by the use of lawfull means, it will not be required of us by God; without whose speciall providence it is not, that he permitteth us to be forbidden that exercise, till the same providence be pleased to remove such hinderance, and open to us a lawfull way of obtaining it. The primitive Christians secret meetings will first be imitable to us, and if that be obstructed also, their solitudes next; and however that designe of obtaining free exercise of our Religion, will never make any practice lawfull to be used in order to that, that before was utterly unlawfull.

But are we not to take care of our children and posterity as well as of our selves? If our Religion be now suppresst, our poor children and progenie to the end of the world may in all probability be kept in blindnesse and ignorance, and so lost to the place of darknesse irrecoverably. This objection stands somewhat pathetically, and is apt to affect our bowels more then our reason; moves our compassion first, and thorow those spectacles is then represented with improvement to our judgement. But for answer to it, though the doctrine of election of particular men, as well and as absolutely to the meanes as to the end, might be (to him that acknowledges it) sufficient amulet against this feat, and so no need of that their jealous care for their posterity, any farther then it is in their power to contribute vow and them (which sure is no more then to doe what is lawfull for them to doe) yet the answer will be more satisfactory to all that acknowledge Gods providence, however opinioned concerning decrees, that whosoever considers himself as a man, much more as a father of a posterity, must have many things to trust God with, and onely God, and among those nothing more

them

then the future estate of those which are to come from him. Yet if he be impenitent and still unsatisfied, unlesse he himself contribute somewhat to the securing of his posterity in this matter, let me tell him there is nothing (after his prayers to God and paternall blessing on them) so likely to entaile his Religion upon them as his sealing it by his sufferings. This sure will be a more probable way to recommend his Religion to them (when they shall hear and be assured by that testimony, that their fathers thus hoped in God) then by that other so distant, that they died in a rebellion against the King, or that this Religion had been in their time unnecessary of the land, and not they done something unlawfull to protect it. Besides, the greatest prejudice which that posteritie (of which we pretend such care) can suffer by my non-resistance, is only to be brought up in a contrary Religion, to hear that way first, but sure not to have their ears deafed against all others when they shall be represented, nor to bring the guilt of non-representation upon them if they be not. And if I bring forth reasonable creatures, I hope they will by the grace of God, make use of their reason and his grace, to finde out that truth that shall (only) be so much concerned in; and if (through no default personall of theirs) they should misse of it, I hope the invincibleness of their ignorance, and their sincere repentance for all their sinnes and errours known and unknown, and their readinesse to receive the truth, if it were or might be represented to them, would be an ample sufficient to Gods mercy in Christ, to preserve them from their pardon, for they were carefull according to their measure of knowledge to escape all other dangers. And all this upon supposition but not concession, that the Religion of him that would fight for it were the truth and onely truth; whereas (and of this I note a more suspicious mark of a false Religion) then that it is fain to propagate it self by violence. The Turkes and the Papists being the onely notable examples hitherto of that practice, till some others, directly upon their principles a little varied in the application, have fall upon the same course now.

Now secondly for the examples of Christ and Gamaliel, but first of Christs. His example (as to this purpose) is (I confesse) a peculiar, (besides that grand transcendent copy proposed from the aggregate of all his life and death, *Matth. 11. 29. learn of me, for I am meek and lowly*.) The first is, *Luke 9. 54.* the inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive Christ, because upon that *James* and *John* remembring what *Elias* had done in the like kinde, *1 King. 18.* and a *King. 1.* ask'd his judgement of it, whether he would be pleased that they should command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, as *Elias* did, that is, in effect whether they should not do well to use whatever power they had (and be confident that God would assist them in it) to the destroying of those who over-awed them (and yet that they were not these Magistrates to whose calling it belonged to punish offenders, which *Christ* knew) for their opposition and affronted them in the exercise of their Religion, (or indeed which would not receive Christ). To this Christ answers (first of all) the words are emphatical, he turned (as to *Peter* when he gave him that check, *Matth. 16. 23.* and rebuked them, and said, *Ye know not what manner of spirit you are of*; that is, *Elias* was a Zelot, (*Ἐν τῷ ζηλοτυπεῖν ζήλου τόμον ἐπιλαμβάνου.* *1 Mac. 2. 58.*) (the full consideration of which will belong to another disquisition) *Non venit animas perdere sed salvare*, not to destroy, but to save. Secondly against *Elias* prophesie, which will not agree with that different calling or profession of a disciple of Christ or Christian, they are mistaken if they think they may do as *Elias* did. From whence by the way is

a

a prohibition fully legall put in against all examples of the old Testament (
any such there were) from being plausible amongst Christians, upon this ground
of Josephus his observing that the Jewes were governed by a Monarchy, God to
ing now were their King on earth for a long time, prohibiting immediately, and in-
terposing by his Oracles, and other particular directions as well as standing Law,
upon that case of Phinees and Elias, &c. by which those acts of theirs, though un-
thorized by no setled or ordinary Law, were yet as legall as whatever in any
other common-wealth were done by authority legally descending from the Su-
preme Magistrate. Which whosoever shall now apply to Christians, besides, that
he professes himselfe an allester of Enthusiasmes, will meet with Christs check to
the Boanerges, Ye know not what Spirit you are of: I have not authorized you to
pretend to the Spirit of Elias, or to doe what a Zelot among the Jewes might
doe.

The second exemplary passage to this purpose is the story of Christs
26. 51. when Christ was apprehended by those tumultuous persons, at the
but servants of the chiefe Priests and Elders (not again by any power of lawfu
Magistrate) Peter drew the sword and smote off one of those servants eares, u
on that Christs Answer is the thing to be observed, vers. 52. then said Jesus un
him, Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall per
with the sword. The fourth particular to Peter, a prime Disciple or Christian
that he having drawn the sword in defence of Christ, and in him of Christianity
it selfe (a more justifiable quarrel then ever any man since undertook under the
colour of Religion) could not be legall; but the reason added of an unlimited
universall obligingness to all Christians: For all they that take the sword (
Peter did, in defence of Christ; &c. or else the citation had not been pertinent
to him) shall perish by the sword. And the two parallel places which are noted in
the margent of our English Bibles are somewhat considerable, the first Gen. 9.
where that Law was given to the Sonnes of Noah, שֹׁפֵךְ דַּם הָאָדָם
concerning the effusion of blood, which sure was not any prohibition to legall,
though capitall punishments of Malefactors (but rather the investing the Ma-
gistrate with that power of the sword) and yet is by Christ urged as a prohibi-
tion to Saint Peter, signifying that effusion of blood by him in that case to be
utterly illegall, notwithstanding the intention of that old Law not abrogated, it seems
by Christ. The other parallel place is, Revel. 13. 10. where immediately
upon the repeating of those words, He that killeth with the sword shall be killed
with the sword, is subjoyned, Here is the patience and faith of the Saints: i. Chri-
stian Martyrs, vers. 7. whose faith it seems and patience must goe together
which sure is most irreconcilable with forcible resistance.

The third exemplary passage of Christ was in his suffering, wherein many
particular circumstances might be observed, especially his answer to Pilate, Joh
19. 11. in acknowledgement of his legall power given him from above. But
all that I shall observe is onely in the generall, That he that had so many le-
gions of Angels, certainly sufficient to defend him and invade his enemies
(whatsoever will be thought of the Christians strength in Tertullians time
have done so too, of which more anon) did yet without the least resistance giv
himselfe up to sufferdeath. And if it should be objected, that this was to accom-
plish what God had decreed (ought not Christ to suffer these things, and thus it

is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer) and in obedience to that decree, not as matter of example to us, or of intimation, that it had not been lawfull for him to have done otherwise. To this I answer, That as Christ was decreed to that death, and non-resistance, so are Christians (if Saint *Paul* may be beleeved) predestinated to be conformable to the Image of his Sonne, *Rom. 8.* that is, to that patern of his in suffering, not fighting for Religion; and that revelation of Gods will in that decree being supposed, it will follow, That though Christ might have lawfully done otherwise, yet we Christians now may not, especially being commanded to learn of him particularly his meeknesse, especially that Lamb-like qualitie of the Lambe of God in his sufferings, *Isai. 53.7.* So much for the examples of Christ.

Now for the like of Christians, it will be needlesse to mention any other then those of whom *Tertullian* and Saint *Cyprian* speak, being so perfectly home to the purpose, *Tertul. in Apol. c.* 37. and his book *ad Scapulam*, wholly to this purpose: and Saint *Cyprian* in his book against *Demetrianus*, for the summe of which is this, That the Christians of that age had strength sufficient either to have resisted or avenged themselves upon their heathen persecuting Governours, but in obedience to the Lawes of Christ, chose rather to die then doe so. The severall testimonies (of which this is the Abstract) being so fully produced by many, and known by all, it will be more then purpose to vindicate them from all exceptions, and intercept all cavils, which the wit of this last yeere (beyond all that any former age pretended to) hath invented to evacuate those testimonies, wherein *Gods Armes are wrested* to a good end: and this I shall take leave to do at large, because it is said, many are left unsatisfied in the lawfulnesse of their present course by those Answers and Objections which that book hath helpt them to.

1. It is objected, the *father* (*Tertullian*) *might be mistaken in making the estimate of the strength of Christians in respect of those against whom they were to oppose them.* This is in civill termes to say, *Tertullian* wrote he knew not what, or at the worst, he might be ignorant of what he affirmeth he knew, and I am confident was more likely to know, living then the wisest objecter now, seeing or conjecturing at the distance of so many hundred yeares: he hath not the least authority (which must be the Judge in matter of fact) on his side against so distinct and cleare affirmation, not onely of *Tertullian* in severall places (and that in an apologie against the Gentiles, who could and would certainly have tript him in so manifest a falshood, if it had been such; and though the negative Argument be not fully convincing, that they did not thus trip him, because we do not hear or read they did, yet will this be of as much force as any he hath to the contrary: This certainly, the writing it to the Gentiles, will be able to conclude, that *Tertullian* had beene very imprudent and treacherous to his own cause to have affirmed a thing in defence of it, which his adversaries could so manifestly have proved a falsity, if it were not so as he affirmed) but of *Cyprian* also, who lived about the same time, and no writer of that age or since produced (I doubt not but I may truly produce) to the contrary.

Of the proofs that are offered to make it appeare possible and probable that *Tertullian* should be so mistaken, the first is, *Because this was no point of sunb, &c. and therefore a devout father might fall under a mistake herein.* I grant he might, but

but that doth not prove he did, nor that it is probable he should be a more incompetent judge in such a matter, then he that now undertakes to controll him: Nay sure, lesse reason is there to deny the authority of the ancients in matters of fact; which if they were not evident to them, must needs be much lesse evident to us, who have no means to know any thing of them but their relations, nor cause to suspect such relations, but either by some impossibility in the things themselves which is not here pretended, or by some other, as authentick relation contradicting it, which is as little pretended) then of faith, the ground of which being onely the written word of God, is common with them to us, and therefore may enable us to judge, whether that which they affirm to be matter of faith be so indeed, to be found really in that sacred Writ from whence they pretend to fetch it.

And whereas it is further added, *That no rule of charity or reason binds us to believe another in any thing which belongs to the art or profession of another, and wherein himself is little versed or exercised.* I answer, that this saying thus applied will take away the authority of a very great part of those Histories which anybody yet hath questioned. If it were spoken of Doctrines, it might hold, and sure to that belongs the axiom quoted, *Quicquid recipitur recipitur ad modum recipientis*: but in matter of relations it is the unreasonablest thing in the world to require the Narrator to be of that profession of which he relates the fact; for then no man must adventure to write a King's life but a King, what's that to Mr. A. or Mr. B. being Ministers of the Word, shall write their Books concerning the Parliaments victory at *Keinton*, and relate the number of the slain on that side so far inferiour to those on the Kings, we must now upon this admonition retract that belefe we then allowed them, and begin now (though too late) to question whether it were indeed a victory or no, which caused such solemn thanksgiving in this City. But then secondly, why this Relation should not wholly belong to the profession of either? if not to *Tertullians*, I cannot yet discern. For the maine of *Tertullians* testimony was, That the Christians chose rather to suffer then to resist, though they were able, because Christian Religion taught the one, & forbad the other: and this sure was not without the privity of the Clergy: but for their strength to resist, depending on the number of Christians, not as even ballancing the heathens in the Empire, but as very considerable and able to raise an army, if they would make head. I doubt not but *Tertullian*, a Presbyter, that now laboured in converting and conforming Christians, and was not alwayes in his study, nay, who had lately been a Lawyer, and so not unacquainted with the publike, might know and relate with far better authority then any who hath dared now to contradict him. For, for the art of *ballancing the power of parties in a Kingdom, and grounds of precise determination of such differences* (which as the Objecter denies *Tertullian*, so he is unwilling to yeeld to the States-man himself;) you shall see anon that we have no need to make *Tertullian* master of it, his relation will stand unmoved without it.

The second proofe to blast *Tertullians* relation, is the ordinary one in fashion now adayes, if any man differs in opinion from us, presently to examine his whole life, and if ever he did or spoke any thing unjustifiable, lay that vehemently to his charge, and by that defame him, and then we may spare the pains of answering his reasons, disproving his assertion, he once lied or sinned, and therefore

fore it is ridiculous to expect any truth from him. The Argument is this, He might *mistake and miscarry* in this, *but not long after he miscarried so grievously, as to turn Montanist, who called himselfe the holy Ghost, &c.* Just as if I should resolve to beleeve no relation of any Minister (present in either of the Armies) of the strength of that Army, untill I had examined, and were assured that he were not a Chiliast, an Arian, nor guilty of any other Heresie condemned by the Church: Yea and more, till I had some degree of assurance that he never would be such. Or as if I should resolve this man knew no Logick, because in this period he offends so much against Grammar in these words [to turne Montanist, who called himselfe the holy Ghost] where the relative [who] hath certainly no antecedent. *Tertullian* cannot, for he called not himselfe the holy Ghost (but onely cited that stile so ordinary now adayes [*nos spirituales*] and all others [*animales psychici*] and Montanist cannot, unlesse as once *Aremas* signified the Areopagites, so now by way of compensation, Montanist must passe for *Montanus*, for he it was that called himselfe the holy Ghost, not all or any of his followers. This way of concluding, from a slip in Grammar, an ignorance in Logick, especially being backt with the suffrage of so many concluding Arguments) will be as faire Logicall proceeding, as to infer, because *Tertullian*, an afterward turned Montanist, therefore then he spake he knew not what. But then Saint *Cyprian* was no Montanist, and yet he affirmed the same that *Tertullian* doth, *contra Demetrian*: As for the *approving of dreames and fained fancies, &c. true prophecies* (which is added to be revenged on *Tertullian* for contradicting this Objecter) I confesse I excuse not him, but wish we might learne any thing of him rather then that. But I hope the narration we have now in hand was neither *Montanists* nor *Brisots dreame*. If it was a *fancie*, it was quite contrary to a *fained one*. And for the close of this Argument, wherein the Objecter [*Smect.*] *as it were from Heaven, how unsafe and dangerous it is to build on the authority of men*, as I desire the Reader may take it home with him, and from thence consider, if he beleeve no longer any thing upon this Objecters authoritie, so destitute of all reason: so I do not yet see, why he that accused should not be allowed to speak truth, the making of true narrations being compatible with the greatest heresie in the world.

The third Argument against *Tertullians* testimony, is an observation of *Salve that there is a promptnesse of inclination in much devotion in persons devoutly given to over-value the workes and pious of other men.* To which my onely answer shall be, that yet I hope it is not observed that devout men are so strongly inclined to tell plaine lies, to this end that they may make themselves over-valued by others. This must be *Tertullians* infirmitie (if the objecter quoth right) being a Christian himselfe, and in his apology labouring to raise an high opinion of Christians in the Gentiles to whom he writes, to which purpose if he should forge falsities, I must confesse it were a shrewd weakenesse, very ill becomming devotion, whatever the practice of later times may say in excuse of it.

The fourth proofe is from a second observation, that in *the pious and orthodox Fathers themselves there are some tenders, and shreines, some fibra of the roots of bitternes which afterwards grew ranke in the times of popery, &c.* The Answ. All that I can collect from hence toward the conclusion designed, is that this objecters sence is, that, for *Tertullian* to say there were Christians enough in the Roman Empire to worke revenge on their oppressors, was a spice of popery; and so there is one new

piece of popery more added, to the many which this age hath concluded under that title above the inventory of the *Trent* catechisme. And so now to debate this any further, or professe my selfe to opine as *Tertullian* did, is to acknowledge my selfe popish, and that is as bad as prælaticall: and so from henceforth all my arguments will but passe for temptations, which none but carnall men must submit to, be they never so demonstrative. Yet must I have leave to wonder how in the close of this Section these words [*the sounder and more considerate knowledge of these latter times*] can have any reference to the point in hand. For certainly, for the strength of the then Christian party, our knowledge in these latter times cannot be sounder or more considerate then theirs that then lived amongst them; or if it be, the words [*latter times*] will be improper, for sure it will be affirmed onely of that time wherein Mr. *I. G.* wrote this part of this book, for I am confident he was the first that ever revealed this act of more considerate knowledge to the world.

The fifth and last proofe is, That *whatever their number was, yet it is no wayes likely they should be suffered to have any armes, &c.* To which, and to all the prudentiall state motives whereon it is grounded, (and so to all that Section) I shall return no answer, but the very words of *Tertullian*, which if all put together they do not defend their author from all their assaults, neither will I believe the Christians strength was sufficient to buckle with their adversaries. His words are plain: first, if we would have exercised, deale like professt enemies, *desiissent nobis numerorum copiæ?* (should we have wanted force of numbers? (*i.* men) or armed souldiers (or to save *copiæ* signifies.) Secondly, he saith as plainly, *Castella, vestra, dicam? Municipia?* we have filled your Castles and Camps (there sure they were armed) and so the Theban Legion, which yeelded themselves to the Emperour, surely wanted neither number nor Armes to have resisted.) Thirdly, he saith, *Cui bello non idonei?* what war had we not been fit for? (*etiam impares copiis*) although we had not had so many armed men as they) *qui tam libenter trucidamur?* Their delighting of death, (nay gladnesse to die) might have put them upon any hazard unarmed, and he professes the onely thing that kept them from rebelling, was the Doctrine which they had learnt, that it was more lawfull to be kild then to kill. Fourthly, he saith, They had a way of revenge without Armes, to wit, by departing from them, by that secession to have brought envie upon them (as for example upon dislike of the present state, to have gone to New England, &c. to raise an odium upon the Old) but this they would not be so malicious as to do neither: nay, besides, *amissio civium ipsa, destitutione punisset*, the losse of so many Citizens would have beene a punishment by making them lesse able to resist other enemies; *plures hostes quam cives apud se remansisse*, there would have been a greater number of enemies, then there would have been Citizens remaining. Fifthly to put all beyond exception, he puts them in minde how one night with a few firebrands they might have wrought their revenge, if it were lawfull for them to repay evill with evill. This one last particular being considered, is so full a demonstration of the truth now in debate, that supposing there were but one Christian at liberty to use that one firebrand, there can be longer doubt but that there was sufficient strength to worke their revenge, if their Religion would have permitted them to do so. And if their Religion (as was said out of him) were the onely restraint, then certainly

(120)

their

their weaknes was not. Nay, though they should after all this (by a morall impossible supposition) be supposed weak, yet if their Religion did truly restrain them, as he professes it did, this were abundantly sufficient to decide the controversie betwixt us and the Objecter.

Having proceeded thus far in answer to the severall exceptions against the truth of *Tertullians* assertion concerning the strength of those Christians, I am invited farther by a second proffer of the Objecter to make appeare, that although *Tertullians* assertion should be supposed true, yet it were insufficient, it would not reach the question or case in hand. This certainly is strange at first sight, the case in hand being, Whether the reason of their non-resistance were their want of strength. Which in all reason must be determined negatively, when once these two things are supposed; first, that they had strength; secondly, that the command of Christ, or making of Christianity was the cause of their non-resistance, and not want of strength. But there is no truth so evident, but the cunning of such a craftsmaster will be able to transforme, both from evidence and truth; and therefore (though in all justice a man might vow never to have commerce with such a man more, that should undertake thus to master his understanding, that he should beleeve and not beleeve the same thing, yeeld the want of strength to bee the cause, at the very time when hee acknowledges or supposes, first, no want of strength, secondly, somewhat else, to wit, the command of Christ to bee the cause) yet I shall (to exercise that Christian meekenesse which I desire to assert by my actions as well as words) wait on this great artificer to the second part of his answer. The summe of which, as he tells us to is this, that *supposing the Father spake truth* concerning their strength, yet *some other considerations he mentions, it had been in those that were called to suffer, both a very irreligious disrespect of themselves, and of charity in respect of others, if they should have made the least resistance.* To which my onely answer shall be to beseech him to consider, that this is part of *Tertullians* testimony, that the thing that restrained them was (not this wisdome but) the doctrine of their Christ; concluding it more lawfull to be kild then to kill, and utterly unlawfull to pay evill for evill. And as for *charity to others*, I humbly wish that were, or may yet be considered, but *mischiefes, &c.* this resistance (of which he is the professed adviser) hath brought on others who are not parties on either side, nor, I hope, ill Christians, if their onely punishable crime be, making conscience of non-resistance.

To the next Section, in answer to a supposed reply, where he saith, *That it is not probable they had any sufficiency of strength.* I answer, that I cannot be so tame as thus to be caught, or so wild as to imagine that improbable, at a time when *Tertullians* testimony is supposed to be true, (as now it is supposed) the speciall part of which testimony is yeelded to be that they had sufficient strength. And where he addes 2. that twas *not necessary they should be of one mind and judgement touching this sufficiency, &c.* I answer, that we doe not assert any such necessity, nor doth our cause any way incline us to it; or want that refuge. For sure we affirme not that they did actually resist (to which onely, that concurrence would have been necessary) but onely that they would not though they were able, and to the evidencing of that, the concurrence of judgement you speake of, is not materiall, for if they that did so thinke of their strength, were upon grounds of Christian patience and obedience, as farre from doing or attempting it, as any other; these men

men would certainely have continued in the same obedience, though all the world had conspired with them in the opinion of their sufficiency. For, to professe Christian meeknesse first, and then upon any supervenient occurrence to be ready for resistance, though it might be a character of the temporary (that I say not hypocriticall) subjection of our daies, yet must not we be so groundlesly uncharitable as so affix it on those Christians; and though the objecter should renounce his present supposition, and againe contend that *Tertullian* lied, and so divest him of all authority as a father, of common honesty as a relater, yet sure he will not be so severe to deny him so much of an ordinary *rhetor*, as to make that an ingredient in his Apology for Christians, which were the highest piece of an accusation. Grant but *Tertullian* to have any skull in any of his professions, suppose him but Orator, if not a Divine, a tolerable pleader, if not a tolerable man, allow him but skill as the Deske, (his first Trade, before he was a Christian) the reputation of a little eloquence, though no sincerity, and his very pleadings will be argumentative, though his words may not.

But 'tis added in the third place, *that having no invitation, countenance, or command from any authority, these resolutions differing from ours.* To which I answer againe, 1. That it was not still the want of such command or invitation, that restrained them, but the pleasure of the Lord of Christ as hath been cleare; but then secondly, I pray let me make a question to of one which I will in reason suppose not to be understood of the Monarchomachi, *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan*, and it is only this whether, Noblemen and Magistrates neglect the worke of reformation, the Ministers may and ought also to attempt it, if they can hope to prevaile. If so, then though the Lords have not just the same now and then, yet the difference is not materiall but we had the like then from Ministers, there would have been no invite, for has God divided the Christian?

But when it is added in the third place, *that we are invited, &c. in a great and no lawfull an authority in this Nation*, here I must confesse I had thought that the King and both Houses had been a great authority, unlesse the meaning be not simply, but all have as great and as lawfull an authority as this State hath any, to which whether it be so, I shall not dare to (till be granted by me, who professe my selfe to suppose it impossible that any command given to this purpose should be lawfull, is able to secure any from that sentence of S. *Paul*, *They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.* Yet once more, it is possible that the Authour, by *this State* may meane a republique, which though it be a word of some signification in some other Countreys, yet that our Lawes acknowledge any such here, I have not yet been taught, nor sure can any part of this Kingdome, without the King be capable of this Title, till we have moulded a new forme of government, and new lawes, as the modell of that; for undoubtedly the old ones are not acquitted with any such. But that I will hope it not the meaning, because it is added that *inferiour Magistrates*, &c. which seemeth to acknowledge that the Parliament without the King, are but inferiour Magistrates. Of the agreeableness of that Title of *Magistrates and Rulers*, to that body without the head, I purpose not to speake; onely to that which is added, that they *should be obeyed as well as Kings*. I answer, without carrying of the place in S. *Peter*, which others have done) that if they are *to be obeyed, but as well as Kings*, then, 1. The King that comands not to do it, is to be obeyed as well as they. 2. Not they against

the

the King, for that the inferiority implies An inferiour Magistrate, in that that is lawfull, and within his Commission, and not so varied by a superiour, is to be obeyed as well as if he were superiour to that, or no more as the superiour in any thing else, but sure not to the despising of the superiours lawfull commands, when they doe interpose, for that were more then as well. When the King commands that which God and the Law doth not forbid, it may be said, that his commands are to be obeyed as well as Gods, which the Apostle intimates, when he saith, you must be subject for conscience sake, and the ground of this truth is, because indeed God the supreame commands that subjection to the King in such matters. But sure for all this the King is not to be obeyed against God, or where any countermand of his hath intervened, be this were in S. *Peters* phrase, *to obey men* more *then* as well *as God*, but rather that God. Thus is it in that other case, the inferiour is to be obeyed *as well as the superiour*, in things lawfull and not contradictory to the Superiours commands; upon that ground of necessity of obedience to the Superiour, from whence Master Calvin, and S. Saint *Peter* saith, *Et bene notandum*, is *sent of God*, that is, by him that is the supreme eminent person, the King; but sure this holds not against the inferiour, as in the other case it did not. 3. Nor they when they are resolved to take up Armes against him, whom S. *Paul* bids me not resist upon pain of damnation, and by my oath of Allegiance (if it were otherwise lawfull) I am bound not to do, that I will not. Whereupon it is observable, that the Ministers of this age, are now brought to undertake, that damnation or *eternall death* shall not signifie damnation poore men, what a weake creed doth the Devill hang in this, is just over their soules? and what a sad condition would it be, if men that dies confident Martyrs in this warre, damnation or the *second death* should not signifie damnation?) but some temporary mulct, and yet withall that this warre is not against the King (when yet that other against the Earle of Essex his army, is not doubted to be against the Parliament) which was so much, and yet distant holds (for if it be not against the King, what need of that distinction, from the damnation that belongs to rebels, or if it be against the King, why may it not say so easily, why may not We be avowed against the King, by any title we shall adventure his wrath? doe sure signifie them consciences to be strangely grounded, and themselves very groundlesly confident, which are satisfied upon no better principles, and whose practises are capeable of no better security.

Upon these grounds thus layd, of obedience due to inferiours as well as superiours (supreame it should be, for so *only* we must here signifie, and I hope that our King amongst us is such) Magistrates, the objecter *puts a case, that the inferiour Governour requires that which is onely honest, &c. as to doe our best to defend our selves against those that contrary to law and conscience assault us, the superiour that which is contrary to both, viz. to sit still, &c.* In this case he resolves it is most cleare on his side, for (whether the lawfulnesse or necessity he intimates not of) *resistance against the superiour.* To this I answer, that it is hard to beleeve that the objecter did not purposely intend to deceive his Reader by that phrase [*onely honest, &c.*] For that is a very doubtfull sence; it may signifie, that nothing else were honest, and then it is in that sence apparently false, for if it were honest to take up Armes against a King, yet sure may not *taking up* Armes be honest too for (whatever that crime of neutrality signifie in the scholes) it may be lawfull for

for a man to suffer injury, to suffer himselfe to be defrauded (and that by a King as well as by an equall) 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. I hope resistance, though it have lately commenced, and taken upon it the degree of vertue, yet hath not turned Projector, got the monopolie of vertue and honesty into its hand, that it should engrosse and enclose that title, and there be no other vertue or honesty besides this; yet would the affirmations of some out of no meaner place then the Pulpit, [that all they that are for the King at this time are Atheists or Papists] conclude and perswade thus much. But I would faine believe that the meaning of the phrase [*only honest, &c.*] is, [no more then honest] not necessary. But if that be it, then sure the superiour Governour may deserve to be obeyed in forbidding it, as well as the inferior in commanding: For it will not follow in that case that the King *commands* somewhat contrary *to the Law of God and nature*, but onely somewhat contrary to something which was agreeable, i. not against the Law of God and nature, i. prohibits a thing lawfull not necessary, as the other is supposed to command a thing lawfull, not necessary: which sure were as free for him to doe, as for the inferiour supposing, as the objecter supposes, *that the command of God indifferently extends it selfe to obedience in either, in things that are lawfull.* Hence it appeares that in the case here put, the command of the Superiour is falsely affirmed to be an unlawfull command: for then the matter of the inferiours command must be supposed *morally* bonum, but *ne* (*vel*) (*necessary*) and if it be a lawfull one, it may and will alwaies void that obligation for that particular, which is supposed by the Law of God to be on us, to obey the inferiour in that which is lawfull. The short is; if that which is here spoken of, be in it selfe necessary, we must do it, as in spight of all commands of the superiour, so without all commands or inhibitions of the inferiour Magistrate; but if it be not necessary in it selfe, neither will the commands of an inferiour make it necessary to any who stands prohibited by a superiour.

In the fourth Section the objecter offers a reason, why those ancient Christians (supposing strength in them) should *rather patiently suffer*, because before their conversion *they had consented to the Emperours power, whereby those Edicts were made for the murthering of Christians, &c.* To which I answer, that it is ridiculous to seeke out of impose upon the Reader probable or possible reasons for their non-resistance, when Tertullian in their name specifies the true onely reason, the Gospell doctrine of Christian patience and obedience. But for the particular of their consent, much might be added, to shew the vanity of that plea, if that were *tanti*, or pertinent. I shall only say, that if the Emperour legally murthered Christians, then their consent to that Law (or to the power of the Emperour who made it) would not bind or dispense with them to commit any thing necessary or otherwise commanded by any greater power; for if I sweare to doe so I must breake my oath, *notwithstanding* what is concluded from *Ps.* 15. 4. And if it were not otherwise necessary or commanded by greater power, then neither is resistance now. And then the Kings prohibition will as much restrain me in any thing not necessary, as their heathenish consent could be supposed to restraine them then. Nay he that makes their *consent a nullity* (as this objecter in fine doth) what reason can he render why he that gave that consent, might not plead that nullity, for such (though carnall) advantages as life is if it could make good his pleading, and no other restraint lie on him, but onely that null-consent?

For

For the fifth Section, How that may be lawfull [for an entire body to do, which may not be lawfull for a part] and so for us now though not for thee? I answer, That if the phrase [entire body] signifie the head and members too, then the period is true; if not, then the whole Section is fallacious: for it follows not, that though the representative body without the head is more, then a party in the Empire, without the representation of the rest, therefore the first may resist forcibly, though the second should not: for he that from Saint PAUL denies resistance of subjects indefinitely to Kings, will not be moved from that hold, by discerning some other slight differences between subjects, unlesse they may appear such that on one side they may authorize resistance. But then secondly, If the Doctrine of Christian patience, &c. were the cause of Non-resistance, then sure was not this other consideration wherein they differ from us, the cause of it.

Well, having gone thus far, in attendance on this Objecter, and to exercise that patience, which we so much desire to perswade: there is yet the greatest sort behinde unvanquished, erected in the sixth Section, and rescued from all supposed assailants in six particulars following, set up like so many fortresses about it. The summe of it is (for I would not be bound to recite what every one may read in the printed Book) that if *those Primitive Christians had strength, and might lawfully have resisted*, (by the way *Tertullian* plainly affirms the first, and is so far from supposing, that he absolutely denies the second) yet might *God hide this liberty from them*; and so his *after dispensations did require that he should hide it from them, and yet manifest it to us: and those differences in times & truths to be Gods counsell of Antichrists coming into the world then, and of his being destroyed and cast out now.* The *hiding of the truth* of subjects power and right to resist their Superiours, *being necessary to help Antichrist up to his throne.* And the *commonalty of Christians doing contrary to the will of their Superiours, being the way that must have the principall hand in executing Gods judgements upon the Whore*, Rom. 13. 1. 2. 6. 9. that is, in the pulling him down.

To this whole Discourse (the first I am confident that ever was written on this Subject) I must answer by degrees, (that I may not omit any thing that is added for proofe or explication by the Authour) and first, I must desire the word *may* or *might* [may hide] may be changed into plain intelligible sense. Say, did God hide the liberty of resistance from those Primitive Christians or no? If he did not, then away with this whole Section, and particularly that affirmation, Pag. 10. that Gods dispensations did require that it should be hid from them: but if God did indeed hide it: then first, this is more then a supposition, it is a plain confession that those Christians *Tertullian* speaks of might not lawfully have resisted, though they had had strength (which was so long denied) for the light being hidden, they must have done it without faith, or against conscience, yea, and against Gods determinate counsell, (who, the Objecter saith, had great causes to hide it, of which one sure must be, that it should not be used. 2. Here is a great secret of new Divinity, that God hides truths (not as Christ spake in parables, because they seeing see not, *Mat.* 13. 13. but) on purpose to help Antichrist to his throne. (of which more anon) As for that instance of those *that cast lots*, I pray consider, whether that be pertinent to prove that God purposely hides

(125)

for a man to suffer injury, to suffer himselfe to be defrauded (and that by a King as well as by an equall) 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. I hope resistance, though it have lately commenced, and taken upon it the degree of vertue, yet hath not turned Professor, got the monopolie of vertue and honesty into its hand, that it should engrosse and enclose that title, and there be no other vertue or honesty besides this; yet would the affirmations of some out of no meaner place then the Pulpit, [that all they that are for the King at this time are Atheists or Papists] conclude and perswade thus much. But I would faine believe that the meaning of the phrase [*only honest, &c.*] is, [no more then honest] not necessary. But if that be it, then sure the superiour Governour may deserve to be obeyed in forbidding it, as well as the inferior in commanding: For it will not follow in that case that the King *commands somewhat contrary to the Law of God and nature*, but onely somewhat contrary to something, which was agreeable, i. not against the Law of God and nature, *i. prohibits a thing lawfull not necessary*, as the other is supposed to command a thing lawfull, not necessary: which sure were as free for him to doe, as for the inferiours supposing (as the objecter supposes) *that the command of God indifferently extends it selfe to obedience in either, in things that are lawfull*. Hence it appeares that in the case here put, the command of the Superiour is falsely affirmed to be an unlawfull command: for then the matter of the inferiours command must be supposed to be *necessary* (saith he) and if it be a lawfull one, it may and will then make void that obligation for that particular, which is supposed by the Law of God to lie on us, to obey the inferiour in that which is lawfull. The short is, if that which is here spoken of be in it selfe necessary, we must do it, as in spight of all countermands of the superiour, so without all commands or invitations of the inferiour whatsoever; but if it be not necessary in it selfe, neither will the commands of an inferiour make it necessary to any who stands prohibited by a superiour.

In the fourth Section the objecter offers a reason, why those ancient Christians (supposing strength in them) should *rather patiently suffer*, because before their conversion *they had consented to the Emperours power, whereby those Edicts were made for the murthering of Christians, &c.* To which I answer, that it is ridiculous to seeke out of impose upon the Reader probable or possible reasons for their non-resistance, when *Tertullian* in their name specifies the true onely reason, the Gospell doctrine of Christian patience and obedience. But for the particular of their consent, much might be added, to shew the vanity of that plea, if that were *ritus*, or pertinent. I shall only say, that if the Emperour legally murthered Christians, then their consent to that Law (or to the power of the Emperour who made it) would not bind or dispense with them to commit any thing necessary or otherwise commanded by any greater power; for if I sweare to doe so I must breake my oath, *notwithstanding* what is concluded from *Ps.* 15. 4. And if it were not otherwise necessary or commanded by greater power, then neither is resistance now. And then the Kings prohibition will as much restrain me in any thing not necessary, as their heathenish consent could be supposed to restraine them then. Nay he that makes their *consent a nullity* (as this objecter in fine doth) what reason can he render why he that gave that consent, might not plead that nullity, for such (though carnall) advantages as life is if it could make good his pleading, and no other restraint lie on him, but onely that null-consent?

For

For the fifth Section, How that may be lawfull [for an entire body to do, which may not be lawfull for a part] and so for us now though not for thee? I answer, That if the phrase [entire body] signifie the head and members too, then the period is true; if not, then the whole Section is fallacious: for it follows not, that though the representative body without the head is more, then a party in the Empire, without the representation of the rest, therefore the first may resist forcibly, though the second should not: for he that from Saint PAUL denies resistance of subjects indefinitely to Kings, will not be moved from that hold, by discerning some other slight differences between subjects, unlesse they may appear such that on one side they may authorize resistance. But then secondly, If the Doctrine of Christian patience, &c. were the cause of Non-resistance, then sure was not this other consideration wherein they differ from us, the cause of it.

Well, having gone thus far, in attendance on this Objecter, and to exercise that patience, which we so much desire to perswade: there is yet the greatest fort behinde unvanquished, erected in the sixth Section, and rescued from all supposed assailants in six particulars following, (as like so many fortresses about it. The summe of it is (for I would not be bound to recite what every one may read in the printed Book) that if *those Primitive Christians had strength, and might lawfully have resisted*, (by the way *Tertullian* onely affirms the first, and is so far from supposing, that he absolutely denies the second) yet might *God hide this liberty from them*; and so his *after dispensations did require that he should hide it from them, and yet manifest it to us: and those dispensations he foresaw to be Gods counsell of Antichrists coming into the world then, and of his being destroyed and cast out now.* The *hiding of this truth* of subjects power and right to resist their Superiours, *being necessary to help Antichrist up to his throne.* And the *commonalty of Christians doing contrary to the will of their Superiours, being the men that must have the principall hand in executing Gods judgements upon the whore, Revel.* 18. 5. 6. 9. that is, in the pulling him down.

To this whole Discourse (the first I am confident that ever was written on this Subject) I must answer by degrees, (that I may not omit any thing that is added for proofe or explication by the Authour) and first, I must desire the word *may or might* [may hide] may be changed into plain intelligible sense. Say, did God hide the liberty of resistance from those Primitive Christians or no? If he did not, then away with this whole Section, and particularly that affirmation, Pag. 30. that Gods dispensations did require that it should be hid from them: but if God did indeed hide it: then first, this is more then a supposition, it is a plain confession that those Christians *Tertullian* speaks of might not lawfully have resisted, though they had had strength (which was so long denied) for the light being hidden, they must have done it without faith, or against conscience, yea, and against Gods determinate counsell, (who, the Objecter saith, had great causes to hide it, of which one sure must be, that it should not be used. 2. Here is a great secret of new Divinity, that God hides truths (not as Christ spake in parables, because they seeing see not, *Mat.* 13. 13. but) on purpose to help Antichrist to his throne. (of which more anon) As for that instance of those *that eat herbs*, I pray consider, whether that be pertinent to prove that God purposely hides

(125)

hides truths from us, or particularly this truth in hand. For sure that liberty God hid from none in the Apostles time; for the preaching of the Gospel manifested the lawfulnesse of meats as well as herbs, onely some saw not, or considered not that that was manifested, and thinking some old legall obligation (as others did circumcision) to lie still on them, submitted to it out of piety. Now apply this to the point in hand. Certainly the liberty of forcible resistance against Superiours (though it should be granted) would never be found of this kinde, a liberty brought into the world by Christ, which before had not beene there. If he shall affirm it was, (as he must if that instance of eating be pertinent) though by the concession of the latter part, he must disclaim all his former old Testam. pleas for resistance, from the people about *Ionathan*, from *David*, and from *Elisha*, yet will he never give any probable appearance for the affirmation in the first part, that Christ gave any such new before-unrevealed liberty: but rather, if any such liberty before there were, it was undoubtedly taken away by Christ, from whose example and precepts it was that those Primitive Christians, and we also, dare not make use of that supposed liberty. The onely thing I can imagine possible to be replyed, is that, though the comparison hold not exactly, yet it may hold in this, that as that liberty of eating was hid to some (it matters not by whom, or how) so this of resisting to others. To which I return, that then it is confesst that this instance doth onely illustrate the Objecters meaning, but not so much as probably confirm his assertion; and then I am sorry I have considered it so long, and therefore to bring the point to an issue, I must thirdly ask, Where this liberty, or the authority for this liberty was, when it was thus hid. Was it in the old Testament? Though it should be there, as it is not, yet it might be taken away in the New, (as those things which in the old Testament, or the law of nature, are neerest to giving of that liberty, are absolutely reformed by Christs Doctrine and practice) and then that were good for nothing. Was it in the new? Then deale plainly, shew the place in the new Testament which gives that liberty, and is now found out by posterity, though hidden to them. Sure we have found out no new Scripture, to them unknown (the Nazarites Gospel though it rehearse some speeches of Christ not in our Canon, yet is not prodnced for any of this nature: that famous one which it fathers on our Saviour, *Nunquam leti sitis nisi cum fratrem in charitate videritis*, is of another stamp, I would to God this Apocryphall Precept might be canonicall among us) and for any place of the known Canon misunderstood by them, and now clearly unclouded and revealed to us in a right understanding, which inforces this, I must be so charitable to the Objecter, as to think that if he had discerned any such, he would not have failed to have shewed it us, (as well as his interpretations of *Rom.* 13. and *Revel.* 17. 17.) if it were but to leave us more usable for not being his Proselytes. Beyond these severall wayes of revelation, if posterity have had any other (or indeed any but that of understanding of Scripture, by Scripture light, or assistance of Gods Spirit, which was not before understood) from whence to fetch a liberty which is not in the old Bible, or is denied in the New, this is it which we desire so to warne men of under the name of Enthusiasme, which is hardly ever distinguishable from a demure frensie, and I must call it now the dreame of the dreamers, *Jude* 8. that despise dominion, speak evill of

dignities

dignation, but far from divine revelation. And yet that this is the thing that this Objecter hath an eye to, (and not the understanding of Scripture more clearly then before) may appeare, in that he affirms this truth *hid from their teachers*, (though *not from all without exception*) who yet if it were hid in the Scripture, were of all others most unlikely not to finde it. As for that offer of proofe, that this truth might lie hid, because there was *no occasion of studying it*: I answer, that in *Tertul.* daies when there was occasion to study it, (as great as ever can arise any, because the persecutions then, were as heavie persecutions) we may by that argument think they would have searcht into it, at lest the light then would not in ordinary account have proved more dim, as he saith it doth, if the Scripture were the candlestick where this light was held out. That which he adds in the next place, *of the spirit of courage, patience, constancie which was by God powred out on the Church in those dayes, and so made martyrdome seem a desirable thing to them*, is more like a reason indeed of their not inquiring into this liberty: and herein, I must acknowledge the ingenuity of the Objecter, or the power of truth which extorted this reason from him, so little to the advantage of his cause, and so much of ours. For this is certainly the bottome of the businesse, the want of Christian courage, patience, &c. (for that kinde of courage is not in fighting, but suffering) hath helpt us of this last age to that [dream, not] revelation of liberty, which was never heard of among the ancients. But by the way, it seems by the Objecter that now martyrdome is no desirable thing, nor taking up Christs Crosse, nor following of him. We are resolved to have no more to do with martyrdome, think that the thousand yeeres for the Saints to reigne on earth are now at hand, and so suffering, or conformity to the image of Christ, no longer the thing we are predestinated to, we must set up a new trade of fighting, destroying, resisting, rebelling, leave enduring to those *Christians which were furnished with extraordinary strength from heaven*. Which are the Objecters words of the Primitive Christians, which, saith he, kept them from studying cases and questions about lawfulnesse of escaping, (which word meere shame had put in, utterly impertinently, in stead of resisting) I confesse, I had thought that our Q. *Mary* Martyrs had had this strength from heaven too; and that it was not like miracles, an extraordinary gift onely for the infancie of the Church: but now it seemes we must expect to see no more Martyrs, till we can remove mountains again: This Objecter, it is cleare, is so resolved against it at this time, and that his actions, as well as writings, will be ready to testifie. For my own part, I trust I shall be as ready to oppose the one, as I am to confute the other, and to thinke nothing more Christian still, then to be crucified with my Christ, and if I might chuse the Article of Christian Doctrine which I should most desire to seale with my blood, I thinke it would be that of meeknesse, patience, non resistance, peaceablenesse, charity, which I conceive Christ hath beene so passionately earnest to recommend unto me, as most diametrically opposite to the most unchristian damning sins of pride, ambition, malice, rebellion, unquietnesse, discontentednesse, &c.

Fourthly, For that whole discourse about Antichrist there must many things be returned. 1. That it is not tolerable in a Christian to affirme that God purposely hid truths, that Antichrist might come into the world; this so harsh sence the objector first disguises in another phrase, that God *by (peculiar dispensation) suffered*

ſerved him to make many truths his foot ſtoole, but indeed that reaches not home to the buſineſſe undertaken to be proved, for it follows not thence, that this of reſiſting ſuperiors was one of thoſe truths, if it were, then God ſuffered him to make uſe of it, which he could not but by its being made known, whereas he ſuppoſes it was then hid, if he mean Antichriſt hid it, and ſo made the holding it, his foot ſtool. Then 1. it was not God that hid it, as before he ſaid, but Antichriſt. 2. It had then been manifeſt before, uſe then began to be hid, when there was moſt occaſion to uſe it, which before he made improbable. If I were put upon the rack I could not give a rationall account of thoſe words of the objector laſt recited, or ſuch as may but be conſonant to his preſent undertakings: that which followes is more clear that *God cauſed a dead ſleep to fall upon thoſe truths*: If he did, I wonder who firſt raiſed them out of that dead ſleep *Jun. Brutus* or *Buchan.* or M. *Goodwin*? but ſtill it ſeems God did on purpoſe hide truths in favour & aſſiſtance to Antichriſt to help him into the world, and this, not like the Spirit of ſlumber ſent on men for their puniſhment, but on divine truths which ſure had not deſerved it, yet more particularly that the doctrine of liberty to reſiſt ſuperiors ſhould be *ſo oppoſite in a ſpeciall manner to Antichriſt*, that it was fain to be laid aſleep to give him paſſage into his throne, ſeemeth very ſtrange to me. 1. Becauſe one piece of Antichriſts pride is to exalt himſelf above all that is called God which is moſtly interpreted Kings, and if rightly, then they that do ſo enhaunce the power of the people; as to make the King *Singulis minorem*, & looſe the rains of obedience ſo far as to permit reſiſtance: will I fear diſcern ſome part of the mark of the Beaſt upon their own breſts. 2. Becauſe the τὸ κατέχον, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 6. and ὁ κατέχων, v. 7. that hindred, or let Antichriſt, and was like to do ſo ſtill, till he were taken out of the way, was by the Fathers commonly reſolved to be the Roman empire or imperiall Soveraignty of Rome, ſee *Tert. Deve ſee* 24. *Ambr. com. in* 2 *Theſſ. Hier. qu.* 11. *ad Algaſ. Chryſ. in* 2 *Theſſ. Cry. Hier. catech. ie. Aug. de civ. Dei l.* 20. *c.* 19 *Lact. l.* 7. *c.* 25 *Oecum. in loc. & ib. S. ver. & Gen.* and therefore on the ſacking of Rome by *Alaricus* the Goth S. *Ierom* preſently expected that Antichriſt ſhould come, and in his book *ad Agerauchiam de monogam.* wonders that any one would think of marrying at that time, hence, have learned men obſerved, was that cuſtome in the moſt ancient times to pray in their Lytur-gies for the laſting of the Roman empire, that ſo Antichriſt might be long a coming, *Tert. Apol. c.* 33 *ad Scap. c.* 2. From whence though nothing elſe can be demonſtratively inferred yet this certainly may; that in thoſe many Fathers opinion the power of Kings continuing intire, was not like to help Antichriſt in, nor conſequently the bringing down that power by the revelation of the doctrine of reſiſtance, like *to cauſe an abortion in Antichriſts birth*, or now tend to the caſting him out of the world.

As for the evidence of that Revelation rule that the communality in oppoſition to their Kings, muſt have the great ſtroke in executing Gods judgement on Antichriſt proved *Revel.* 18. 4. 6. 9. I muſt anſwer, 5. That I ſhall never wonder enough at the power of Prejudice evidenced in this Objecter, by what he hath put together to this purpoſe page 32. To prove that the people contrary to their Kings ſhall deſtroy Antichriſt, this is thought by him ſufficient evidence, that *the people are commanded to go out of her*, verſ. 4. when verſ. 9. it followes that the *Kings of the earth ſhall bewail her, and lament for her*: The concludingneſſe of the

argument

argument I shall not insist on, but onely look forward to another place which he cites immediately *Revel.* 17.17. *Where the ten Kings are said to hate the whore and make her desolate.* Now the word Kings in this last place signifies, saith the Objecter, not the persons of Kings but their states and Kingdomes, and to this purpose proofes are produced, but 1. I beseech him to deal ingenuously: doth the word King ever signifie the kingdome opposed to the King, i. Any part of the Kingdom excluding the King; but then 2. See the mystery of prejudice which I mentioned where it is for the Objecters turne *Revel.* 18. The Kings of the earth must signifie their persons in opposition to their people, but where it is not for his turne *Revel.* 17. There the word Kings must signifie the people or any but the King: Would not the spirit of meeknesse have easily compounded this businesse, and have given the word (Kings) leave in both places to signifie both their persons and their Realmes, and so have reconciled the places that some Kings with their Kingdomes should bewail her, and some again hate her, they bewail her, that continued with her till her destruction, when they see the smoak of her burning 18.9. and others hate her who had once tasted of her filthinesse, and repented and left her before, this were very agreeable to those texts, if we had not peremptorily resolved to fetch fume other sence out of them. 3. That first place alone by it self concludes onely thus much that good men come (or are exhorted to come) out from Antichrist, and avenge the whore, and earthly men that have love to her, bewail her, but not that either the first are all common people (for sure Kings may be called Gods people, or be in that number) or the second none but Kings, as for the proof that those people, vers. 4. are the subjects of those kings verse 9. Because they are such as come out of Babylon, sure that is very weak, for Babylon being the province of the whore, there may be kings as well as subjects there, and those Kings come out too, as well as those subjects. For suppose King and people of England all popish, why might they not all reform together? It seemes Antichrist must never be cast out of a Kingdom till the people do it in spight of the King, and therefore it is concluded that it was not done here in the dayes of King *Edward* nor Queen *Elizabeth* nor King *James*. and now since the new Revelation have assured men that Antichrist must now be cast out utterly from among us, it is become necessary that our Soveraign should be a papist, and as much zeal and as solid arguments used to perswade our friends that indeed he is so, (though his constant word and actions now evidence the contrary) as are produced to maintaine any other article of our new Saints belief: one of the most suspected and hated heresies of these dayes, is to doubt of the popish affections of our superiors especially the King: Well by this doctrine, if the King should chance not to be a papist, he must turne to be one, or else popery cannot be cast out in his time. If so he should do, turne papist on purpose to prepare, or dispose his kingdom to turne Antichrist out, this might be but answerable to Gods hiding of truths to that end to help Antichrist in. But should his Majesty be so malicious as to proove Protestant in earnest, then what would become of that sure word of prophecy that so many have bin perswaded to depend on, that Antichrist must now be cast out of this Kingdome, which saith the Objecter cannot be, unlesse the people do it while the King bewailes, I hope I have said enough of this.

As for the connexion of this observation with the conclusion in hand (though in matter little now the observation is proved so false) yet I shall adde that if the people were to do that great feat of casting out Antichrist, yet it appears no how liberty of forcible resisting their Kings should be a necessary requisite to the work, unlesse the lawfull King be the Antichrist in every country, for otherwise it is very possible that though they obey their kings they may resist Antichrist, though they love and revere their lawfull superior they may hate and abjure their unlawfull: Once more, whereas it is again repeated that the *knowledge of the supposed subjects liberty would have kept Antichrist from his throne*, I repeat again, that if it would, God sure would have revealed it to them of all others, unlesse it appear that God was more angry with the sins of Christians in *Tertullians* age, and so more fought against them, then he doth in ours against us, for though God may of mercy undeserved throw down Antichrist, yet that he should so immediately and illustriously labour to set him up, unlesse out of deserved indignation to a people, is not easily resolved, yet if this may appear *de facto* to be so, I shall yeeld, till then *Anno*.

The last blot laid on *Tertullian* to obliterate all whatsoever can be fetcht from him is, that *the authority of Tertullian and the submission of the Christians being both Apocryphall is too light to weigh against the practice of the great Prophet Elisha &c.* To which I answer, that that being supposed, yet the grounds on which *Tertullian* saith the Christians of his time did so patiently suffer, *viz.* the doctrine of Christian patience and meeknesse, are not Apocryphall, nor inferiour to that of *Elisha*, though it were supposed to be argumentive, or concluding for resistance. For any thing else added by the objector in this businesse as the disproving of *Tertullians* reflections on grounds of Christian doctrine, from the contrary practice of *David* and *Elisha* though I might answer in one word, that Christians are restrained from some things which were practiced without fault in the old Testament, yet because those old Testament-examples have been fully cleared by many others of our writers, & indeed are not pertinent to the discourse I was upon, when this Objector first set me in the way, and led me this wilde goose chace after him, I shal not be so impertinent as to adde any thing, but conceive my self to have vindicated the reflections of those Fathers from all possible objections, and so to have joyned the practise of Christians, (those ancient primitive ones) and proved them correspondent to the example of Christ, and so to have made good my second argument proposed from the example of Christ and Christians.

My third is from the very making of Christianity, and particularly of the Protestant Doctrine. And as of Christianity, which as it differs from the Lawes both of *Moses* and Nature, so it constantly reformes and perfects those (dissolves not any thing that was morall in them, nor promises impunity for non-performance, but upon repentance and reformation) elevates and raises them to an higher pitch, as Christian Jewish or natural men had conceived or understood themselves obliged to, which the ancient Fathers generally resolve to be the meaning of those words, *Non venio, solvere*, &c. to fill up all vacuities in those former Lawes, and adde unto them that perfection which should be proportionable to that greater measure of grace now afforded under the Gospel. Thus in that Ser-

mon

mon upon the mount, that ἐκεῖνο ἐστὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον, that top of practicall Divinity, (set down by way of particular instance of Christs purpose, κωλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι) besides the third prae-mitt beatitude, Blessed are the meek, which certainly though it may containe more, yet excludes not, but principally notes the meek, obedient subjects under government, the non-resisters, and therefore hath the same promise annext which the Law had given in the fifth Commandement (twas there, That thy dayes may be long in the Land: tis here, They shall possesse the earth, τὴν γῆν, which Psal. 37. 11. whence it is cited, referres clearly to the land of Canaan, though improved into an higher sense now in the Gospel.) And again, besides the seventh beatitude of the peace-makers, or peaceable (εἰρηνοποιοὶ and εἰρηνικοὶ, being equivalent in the Scripture stile, vid. Iam. 3. 18.) and the eighth, of those that are persecuted for righteousnesse sake, (whence sure is not excluded the cause of Religion and Christianity it selfe) which sure are opposite enough to forcible resisting of lawfull Magistrates, especially for Religion: besides all these, I say, in the introduction to that Sermon, there is in the body of the Sermon it selfe, an Ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, which sure prohibits all forcible resisting or violence even to the ὁ πονηρὸς, the injurious or πονηρὸς from πόνος troublesome person which if it should chance to be our King, would not certainly be more lawfully or Christianly resisted then any body else; especially, when it is our religion which is invaded, which of all other things a whole army of plunderers cannot rob us of, (as they may of the cloak ver. 40.) and therefore needs not our violence to retain it, nor is ever injured, but more illustrated by our suffering. To this may be added the consideration of the depositum left by Christ with his disciples, pacem peace John 14. 27. (which it seemes onely the beloved disciple had recorded) Peace I leave with you, externall peace, for the pacem meam, my peace follows after as a gift perhaps peculiar to them that prized and kept this legacy, and if it be objected that Christ came not to send peace, but a sword, Matth. 10. 34. that sure refers not to Christs prime counsell or purpose, but to the event; what he foresaw it would be, not what he had determined it ought (which manner of speech is very ordinary in all authours) for the precept is punctuall to Peter against the use of the sword and to all the disciples for preserving of peace Mar. 9. 50. And to that it is thought the mention of salt belongs in that place, which among other qualities is εἰρηνικὸν unitive, have salt in your selves, and have peace one with another. On these texts many effectuall emphaticall descants are added by the Apostles, Rom. 12. 18. If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men: and Heb. 12. 14. follow peace with all men διώκετε an agonisticall word to run for it as for a prize or βραβεῖον, and 1 Thess. 4. 11. φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, we render it study (it is, be emulous, contend, strive, make it your ambition) to be quiet, to which I shall onely adde two places more, Iames 3. 17. 18. The wisdome which cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable &c. which before ver. 13. he had called meeknesse of wisdom, then 1 Pet. 3. 3. where after direction for the ὑποταγὴ obedience of wives to husbands (and we know the kingdoms relation to the King is besides others, that of a wife to an husband who is therefore espoused to it with the ring at his Coronation) it is added, ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος, that her bravery consists

(131)

fits in the sincerity (I think it should be rendred) of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. If it be objected, that these many places of peace are but generall wide illations against resistance, or however, no more pertinent to the case about resisting of Magistrates, then of any other private man: I answer, that though I might thus argue, *a minori*, (and also assume that no other resistance is neere so destructive of peace as that resisting of the Supreame power, that being indeed the shaking of government it self, which is the band of peace, and the dissolving of which, returns us to the state of common hostility, leaves us a wildernesse of Beares or Tygers, not a society of men) yet I shall confesse, that I intended not to lay any more weight on this part of the Argument, then any man will acknowledge it able to beare, and that therefore before I inferre my conclusion of non-resistance from the making of Christianity, I must adde to these places so passionate for peace, another sort of places concerning obedience, of which (without naming the places being so known already) I shall venture this observation, that in the new Testament especially the Epistles of the Apostles (which were all written in time of the reign of wicked heathen bloody adversaries of Christianity, and can referre to none but those) there is no one Christian vertue, or article of faith more cleerly delivered more effectually inforced upon our understandings and affections to be acknowledged by the one (against all pretence of Christian liberty to the contrary) and submitted to by the other, then that of obedience to Kings, &c. It were most easie to vindicate those places from all the glosses and scholia's that the writers of this year Master *Goodwin* & *auctores*, Master *Bar.* Master *Bridges*, &c. have invented to free themselves and others from the obedience most strictly required there, but I would not again trouble any ingenious man with such extravagant discourses as even now I learne by experience would be necessary to answer such exceptions, which means war or somewhat worse hath produced, besides, those places have been by others vindicated already. I shall onely say whosoever can without coloured spectacles finde ground for the present resistance in those places of Scripture *Rom.* 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. 18. &c. So far as to settle and quiet a conscience, I shall not conceive my understanding fit to duel with his, any more then I would wrestle with a friend, or combat with the fire, which *Pythagoras* tels me would avail little: he that can be sure that damnation *Rom.* 13. 2. signifies not damnation, but some temporary mulct onely (if the King should prove able to inflict it) when, v. 5. It is added we must needs be subject not onely for wrath (i. Fear of temporary punishment) but also for conscience sake, (which when it accuses, bindes over to eternall wrath, or damnation) I professe I know not what camel he may not swallow; I shall onely in the bowels of Christ desire him to consider, what a sad condition it would prove, if being on this confidence engaged, and by Gods hand taken away in this war he should at Gods tribunall hear Saint *Paul* avouch that by κρίμα or damnation in that place, he did meane no lesse then eternall damnation without repentance: O how would his countenance change, his thoughts trouble him, the joynts of his loins be loosed, and his knees smite one against another, one generall συγχύσις possesse all his faculties, and Master *Bridges* &c. be unable to settle him or give him confidence any longer, when the *Pistol* shall come out of the wall over against that interpretation

(132)

of this, that it is weighed in the ballances (of truth & judgement) and found wanting, of this word value I designe another discussion: only I could not refer to forewarn the Reader of his danger in this place, and now I shall not doubt from the making of Christianity to inferre my conclusion of non-resistance, not doubting but the premisses will bear it.

For the other part of this third argument from the making of the Protestant Doctrine, I would fain be very brief, by way of compensation for my former importunity, and therefore shall engage myself now to trouble the Reader with citations or names, which yet might be brought by hundreds of reformed Writers for every *Iunius Brutus*, *Buchanan*, and *Bethuen* that hath appeared for the contrary since the reformation. Though the truth is, such as these if they must be called Protestants, are yet in this somewhat more then tinctured, I may say perfect Jesuits in their principles, and resolutions concerning Kings (no Papist of any other order hath gone so far) although they differ from what is in the seat of the power of making such sentence. That which I designed as my main point is only, This that the doctrine of Allegiance to Kings, and of their supremacy in all causes, hath always been counted a principall head of difference between the Protestants and the worst of Papists, and a speciall evidence which most men have used, to conclude the Papacy to be *Antichrist*, or the antichrist. Is this that the Pope exalteth himself above all that is called God? 2. The Kings of the earth, that be in case the King be not a Catholick, absolutely subject both in Allegiance to him, that he pretends power over them in all small things, and in temporall in order ad spirituale. It is not unknown to any that the Oath of Supremacy if not of Allegiance among us is purposely designed to discerne and discover Papists, of whom, one of the prayers appointed for the 5th of November affirmes, that the religion is rebellious: that sure is that one main difference betwixt Romish and English, Popish and Protestant doctrine is that of liberty to Rebell in some cases, particularly in that of Religion: In opposition to all which doctrines of insinuation of their's there is no Church that ever expresst their sence in any article more fully and largely, then ours hath in this particular, in twelfe the severall parts of the homily of disobedience and rebellion, printed in Queen Elizabeth's time. And if herein all other parts of the reformed Church have not gone as far as we, yet shall I not retract my asserting this doctrine purely Protestant, because this Kingdom hath always been esteemed a prime part of the Reformation, wherein the Papacy was legally cast out, not by violence or tumults of the people, and so nothing rejected but what in sobriety was necessary to be rejected, and therefore our Church hath generally been the Norme or rule by which others have desired to compose themselves, and never yet any other so preferred before us, as that our ancestours could think it to conforme to them: 2. because in many other countries the government is not regall or Monarchicall as here it is, *Rex* i. e. *Pater populi*. I can finde none of this nature in Europe, but France and Spaine, and England and Scotland (I conceive Ireland be contained under the word *Anglia*) in which Faith he, *Regia fere controversia inter regale exemplum latinos fere omnes, & europæos omnes est*. It seems Mather Dale our Embassadour from whom he had received the advertisements of the state of this kingdome had not then heard that our King though *Anglia* is not *verus*

surnamed, which certainly had divested him of all Soveraignty, it being impossible that the Soveraign or supream of all should be *Minor*, then any (*summi principis vitam, famam aut fortunas invidiosum movere, seu vi seu judicio constituto id fiat*, &c. As for the Emperour of Germany *Charles* the fifth by name, he saith plainly, *Evanuisse civitates ad rempublicam oppressit cum jura majestatis non haberet*, which if it be true will be some excuse to the German Princes in what they did at that time in taking up armes for Religion, though it is most certain what he affirmes, that when those princes confulted *Martin Luther* about it, *num id jure divino liceret*, whether it were lawfull in the sight of God, *illo negavit* he resolved it utterly unlawfull: this answer saith *Bodin*, *Luther* gave *Publicæ æquæ si Carolus summum imperii solus haberet*, and therefore much more must it be given when the case is of a Monarch indeed, as he concludes, and though he acknowledge that distinction which it seemes *Luther* did not betwixt that Emperour and true Monarchs, yet is he faine to make a like observation upon the fact of those Princes in taking up armes for Religion, against *Luthers* advice: *Ita summum bellum reique publicæ calamitosum fuisse ut ejus in gentis principum ac civili strage, quis infra cum nulla videri posse adversus potiorem arma sumere*. I would to God those words were English in every of our hearts: a direfull and calamitous war with the slaughter of all sorts, because (though it were for Religion) yet no cause can be counted just of taking up armes against ones country. The truth is, what was done there though very unhappily and against no Monarch, hath been thought imitable by *Knox* and *Buchanan* in Scotland, and from thence infused into some few into England as *Penry*, &c. But by Gods providence hath formerly been timously restrained, and not broken out to the detamning of our Protestant profession. It seemes now our sins are ripe for such a judgement, the land divided into two extreams sinfull parts; one by their sins fitted to suffer under our doctrine, others sinfull enough to be permitted to broach and profecute it. I meekly thank God, that though my sins are strangely great, yet he hath not given me up to that latter judgement. I conceive I have also given some hints at least of proving my position from the making of the Protestant Doctrine.

Now for the last Topick, taken from the constitution of this kingdome. Though that be the Lawyers task, very properously undertaken by others, yet one generall notion there is of our Laws, which from my childhood I have imbibed, and therefore conceive common to all others with me, and it is this, That the Laws of this kingdom put no man (no Papists I am sure) to death for religion. When Jesuites, and Seminary Priests have suffered, every man is so perfect in the Law, as to know that it is for treason, by a Statute that makes it such for them to come into this kingdome. The much of this, and the constant pleading of it against all Objecters, hath made me swallow it as a principle of our Law, that even Popery strictly taken (and not onely as now this last yeere it hath learne to eplarge its importance) is no capitall crime. From whence I profe, I know no impediment to forbid me to conclude, that in the constitution of our state no war for Religion is accounted a lawfull war; for that it should be lawfull to kill whole multitudes without any discernment, yea and by attempting it to endanger at least our own. Many good Protestants lives, for that, which if it were proved against any single man, would not touch his life in the least degree,

degree, is, I must acknowledge, one of the *Arcana fidei* which I cannot see into. And therefore *Sleidan* tells us of M. Luther, that he would not allow a war, though but defensive, with the Turk himself, *com. 14. pag. 293.* and though after he had mitigated his opinion upon a new state of the question, and perswaded the Emperour to it, yet it was with this limitation, *Modo nec vindicta, nec gloriæ aut cupiditatis causa fiat bellum*; (three things that scarcely ever keeps out of) *war sed tantum pro salute & tranquillitate totius reipublicæ, vitandæ seditionis causa.* It seems the cause of Religion, although it were of Christianity against Mahometisme, was not to him sufficient warrant for a defensive war. But then

2. For this war to be waged against the Prince, (or by any one but the Prince, in a Monarchie, as this is) who whatsoever he hath not, hath certainly the power of the sword immediately from God (or else must be acknowledged not to have it at all, for this power cannot be in any people originally, or any where but in God, and therefore it may be most truly said, that though the regal power were created first to be first given by the people, yet the power of the sword, wherewith regality is endowed, would be a superaddition of Gods, hence belonging to regal or whatever other power, till God annext it in Gen. 9. 6. which also seems to be out of all dispute in this kingdome, even at this time, where the universal body of the Comonalty, even by those that would have the regal power originally in them, is not yet affirmed to have any aggregate power, more hereof than every man single out of government was presumed to have over himself, which sure is no power of his owne idea for even to murder himself is *Selonis dejs*, and therefore the representative body of the Commons, as not at present being a judicature in civil matters, that it cannot administer an oath; and therefore is not justly invadable by any subject, or community of subjects, who certainly have not that power nor pretend to have it, and when they take to arms by necessity, to decide this fact by pretence of necessity, which every body knows, is the colour for those things which have no ordinary means of justifying them; like that which Divines say of saving of children and ideots, &c. by some extraordinary way.) Nay,

3. For this war to be waged, not against Popery, truly so called, but against the onely true Protestant Religion, as it stands (and by attempting to make new laws is acknowledged as yet to stand) established by the old Laws of the land, and therefore is fain to be called Popish; and our Masty reformers no able, by those fiery chariots of theirs, to get out of the confines of Babylon) that it may be fit to be destroyed; just as the Primitive Christians were by the persecuters put in wilde beasts skins, that in those shapes they might be devoured. This I confesse is to me a complication of riddles, and therefore put by some Artists under that deepe, dark phrase, and title of fundamentall Laws of the kingdome; to which certainly no liberty or right of the subject in *Magna charta*, no nor legislative power will enable any man to give any intelligible, much lesse legall name; At which I professe I am not ill pleased, because this I hope will keep it from being recorded to posterity.

I have done with my poore Arguments, and am heartily sorry I have kept my Reader so long from his prayers, which must succeed to this controversy, for sure Arguments are too blunt to do it; I beseech God to direct all our hearts to a constant use of those meanes (together with fasting and abstinence, at least from

from farther provoking him) as more to shew evill upon all him divide his titles (of Lord, Creator, Governour, Protector, Redeemer, Father, and now at length Judge) and so conveyes among us, and by these means infects his mortiferous poison into the very veines of this whole kingdom. [I create the fruit of the lips, peace to him that is far off, &c. and I will heal him. Thou hast moved the land, and divided it, heal the sores thereof, for it shaketh.]

The word κρισις according to its originall signifies Censure, Judgement, and as in naming hath no intimation, either of the quality of the offence to which this judgement belongs, or of the Judge who inflicts it: that it belongs to humane judgements, or sentences of temporall punishments sometimes, is apparent by Luke 23. 40. where one thief saith to the other, Οὐδὲ σὺ φοβῇ τὸν θεὸν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ, fearing, it seems, the same sentence of death, or capitall punishment, called κρίσις Ἰουδαίων, 2 Cor. 11. 24. judgement of obstinate temporall punishment: sometimes it signifies also divine judgements, as appears Matth. 12. 41. The men of Nineve shall rise in the judgement (that is, certainly at the end of this world, at that day of doome, for Matth. 25. 31. it is the judgement of God, and so again vers. 36. which vers. is explained to be wrath or punishment against the day of wrath, &c. so Heb. 6. 2. resurrection of the dead, and eternall judgement. The truth is in this sense it is often taken in the Book of the Psalms, Psal. 1. 5. Psal. 9. 7. Psal. 96. 13. and therefore Hesychius, the best Glossary for the new Testament, renders it κρίσεως ἀνταπόδοσις, the Christian reckoning or payment, or rendring accounting for words. It will be well worth the while to survey and consider every place where the word is used in the Book of Psalms, it will perhaps resolve with me to accept of this glossary, and interpret it constantly of Gods judgements, unless, when the circumstances of the place shall enforce the contrary, as they do in the places last mentioned, and in Psal. 6. 5. But then when the context rather leads us to the second sense, let us not be too hasty for any thing to apply it to him and his judgements, for by so doing, he may seem to accuse himself or others to some sin, and run into that error, as it signifies a rash judgement, which by the most understanding he doth not conceive himself in any danger of. Of places which without all controversie thus interpret themselves, I will mention two, 1 Pet. 4. 17. ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ, whose judgement of a long time lingereth not; which that it belongs to temporall vengeance, I appeal by other words, ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν πρῶτον, we condemn, their damnation is not lingring, their destruction sleepeth not. The second place is, 1 Tim. 3. 6. ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμπέσῃ, fall into the condemnation of the devil; that is sure into the sentence that fell upon Lucifer for his pride (being cast out of heaven, and reserved to chains of eternall darkness) for the same reason of these, as the Novice, or new Convert is likened unto a tale, just parallel to the Angels newly created, lifted up with pride also as the Angels and the person parallel, and so are the punishments also. Now these places more dicte are which appear to me by the same means of evidence, or rule of interpreting, to belong to the same sense, though I cannot say of them as I did before, [without controversie.] For I see it once only doubted by some, whether they do belong to this sense or no, but that it is resolved they do

(136.)

do not; which resolution sure must be obnoxious to some danger, that I say no worse of it. The first of these places is, Rom. 13. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήμψονται: we render it, They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation: But say others, it must be rendered judgement, as that signifies some temporary punishment which the higher powers may inflict, and nothing else: and this they labour to make appear by the words following: For rulers are a terrour to evill works, and he beareth not the sword in vain, &c. To which I answer, That there is no doubt made by me or any, but that rulers are to punish men for evill works, particularly that of resistance against them, and not onely that, but also crimes against our brethren, and God; and in that respect it is added, v. 4. Θεοῦ διάκονός ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, the minister or officer of God he is, and executioner for wrath, that is, punishment temporall to him (indefinitely) that doth evill. But doth it follow from hence, that either he that makes forcible resistance against the superiour or supreme power, or that commits any other sin (which the supreme power is set to avenge or punish temporally) shall incurre no eternall punishment? If this new Divinity should be entertained, it must be priviledge and protection to other sins as well as resistance and rebellion, even to all that any judiciall lawes have power to punish, for in these also he is the Minister of God: ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν, an avenger, or executioner for punishment, and there is no avoiding it; but this must be extended indefinitely, or universally, καὶ ἐπὶ παντὶ πράγματι, to any malefactour punishable by that power, or that comes under this cognisance; and so by this Logick, he that is hanged, may not be damned, what ever his crime be, an execution on earth shall be as good as a Purgatory to excuse him from any other punishment. But then secondly, suppose a actuall escape (the hand of justice here below, by flight, &c. nay, that he prosper in his rebellion, and get the better of it, that the King be not able to punish him, nay, yet further, that he proceed higher, depose the King, and get into his place; What κεῖμα is he like to receive, if that signifie onely the Kings wrath, or temporall punishment? Sure this prosperousnesse of the crime must make it cease to be a crime, make it commence vertue, as the Turks on their principles are wont to resolve it, saith *Busbequius, Ep 4.* —*Et Ipsiusmet quæ Turcis infidit ut res quocunque consilio inita ut ea, si bene cadant, ad Deum Authorem referunt, &c.* Or else give it, (though it be a sin never so great, and unrepented of) perfect impunity both in this world, and in another; and certainly this is no jest. For he that observes the behaviours of many men, (the no manner of regrets or reluctancies in their course of forcible resistance, save onely when they conceive it goes not on so prosperously as it was wont, and the great weekly industry that is used to perswade all men of the continued prosperity of the side, as being conceived far more usefull and instrumentall to their ends, then the demonstration of the justice of it, mens consciences being resolved more by the Drumm then the Bible, by the Intelligencer then the Divine, unlesse he turn Intelligencer also (I would we had not so many of those pluralists.) Will have reason to resolve that this Divinity is the principle by which they move; which if it be not yet brought to absurdities enough, then look a little forward to the conclusion, deduced and infer'd, v. 5. Wherefore ye must be subject, not onely for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Words by Prophetick Spirit added

by the Apostle, as it were on purpose to contradict *in terminis* that new interpretation. Wrath signifies that temporall punishment, v. 4. which if it were the all that is meant by κείμα, then how can it be true, that we must be subject & not only for wrath? Certainly he that resists is not subject (ἀνυπότακτος, is all one with ἀντιτάσσεται, and both directly contrary to ὑποτάσσεσθαι, the word used both in the third and fifth verse) and therfore if we must be subject not only for wrath, as that signifies temporall punishment, then he that resists, shall receive more then wrath, as that signifies temporall punishment. viz. κείμα, in our rendering, condemnation, if he do not prevent it timously by repentance: which sure is the importance of the διὰ καὶ διὰ συνείδησιν, but also for conscience sake; that if he do it not, it will be sin to him, wound his conscience, binde him over to that punishment which belongs to an accusing conscience, (which sure is more then a temporall mulct) which is farther clear from the first verse of that chapter, the command of subjection. For sure every Divine or Apostolicall command entred into the Canon of Scripture, doth binde conscience, and the breach of it known and deliberate, is no lesse then a damning sin, even under the Gospel, mortiferous and destructive without repentance, which is just equivalent to the κείμα λήψεται, he shall receive damnation in our way of interpreting it. So much for that first place.

The second is 1 *Cor.* 11.29. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or as our margent judgement) to himself, &c. This place I finde avouched for the confirming of the former interpretation *Rom.* 13. That κείμα signifies onely Temporall punishment and thus, it is known the Socinians commonly interpret this place, *per κείμα non simpliciter eam damnationem nominatim, sed simpliciè in genere intelligendum esse Volkelium l. 5 de ver. rel. l. 4. c. 22.* That which is used to perswade this to be probable is that which followes ver. 30. for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep, which belonging onely to Temporall punishments, is conceived to be a periphrasis of the κείμα judgement, which should seeme consequently to be so also: and indeed, *Volkelius* hath added other proofs: 1. Because the Apostle speaks of any one single act of this sinne of unworthy receiving (not of any habit or custome) which he conceives not actually damning now under the second covenant. 2. Because it is said ver. 32. and when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord that we should not be condemned &c. To these three (and I know not that there are produced any more) probabilities, I conceive clear satisfaction maybe given by those who affirm κείμα to contain in it eternall punishment, Though if it were onely Temporall punishment, yet being sicknesse, &c. Which are not inflicted by the magistrate, but by the hand of God it will not come home to that which was by Master *Br.* affirmed of the word in *Rom.* 13. For this must be promised that we do not conceive it to signifie eternall punishments *exclusivè* or so as to exclude temporall, but eternall and sometimes Temporall too (for so sure he that for his Rebellion receives damnation, hereafter, is not secured from being hang'd drawn and quartered heere) or else eternall if he repent not, and perhaps Temporall though he do by κείμα, as I said, I understand with *Hesychium* ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τιμωρίαν, Gods vengeance whether here, or in another world; but I say in this place both of them, (and so ordinarily in the former also. This being premised, the word κείμα may still con-

tain

tain in it eternall punishments, ver. 29. though many for this cause of unworthy receiving did fall sick and die, ver. 30. for 1. they might both die and be damned too, or if, as *Volkelius* saith the word κοιμωνται, *obdormiscunt*, sleep, be never used in the N. T. of those that are destined to eternall destruction, then still may this be very reconcilable without interpretation that many for this cause are weak and sickly, and many others sleep, God chastising some by diseases to reform them, and punishing others, who as *Volkelius* acknowledges, were guilty onely of some single act of the sin onely with death temporall or shortning their dayes: which certainly hinders not but that God might punish others that did customarily commit this sin (and perhaps with greater aggravations) with no lesse then eternall death, how ever that it were just for him to do so, what ever he did it is plain by ver. 27. which is parallel to the 29. whosoever shall eat and drink unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, that is in *Volkelius* his own words *Ipsum Christi corpus ac sanguinem contemnere & ignominiâ afficere ac quantum in ipsis est profanare proculcareque censendi sunt*, shall be thought to contemne and disgrace, and as much as in them lies to profane, and tread under feet the body and blood of Christ, which what is it but to count the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing, *Heb.* 10. 29. Which, yet there is used as a main aggravation of that sin, for which, saith the Apostle there remaines no more sacrifice, ver. 26. It is apparent that the phrase ενοχοι τω σωματι & guilty of the body, &c. Is paralled to the Latine *Reus Majestatis* used for a Traitour, and sure signifies no lesse then a guilt of a great injury to Christ, which how any man can affirme to be a sin to which no damnation belongs (supposing no antidote of invincible ignorance or weaknesse, nor recovery by repentance nor gracious pardon of God in not imputing some single act of it) I professe my self not to discerne, though I think I have weighed impartially all that is said of it. This sure will keep the first proof from being any longer probable, and for the second, (or first of *Volkelius*) it is already in effect answered too, for though he that is guilty onely of some one act of this sinne found mercy, yet sure they that are guilty of the customary sin, may speed worse, and indeed of all indefinitly the Apostle speaks according to the merit of the sin, as when he saith the drunkard and adulterer shall not inherit the kingdome of God. Where yet perhaps he that is guilty onely of one such act may finde mercy. For the last proofe, I conceive it so far from being a probable one against me, that I shall resolve it a convincing one on my side, for if those that were sick, &c. Were chastened of the Lord, that they should not be condemned, then sure if they had not been so chastened, nor reformed by that chastening, they should have been condemned with the world; and so their temporall judgements may be a means through the mercy of God in Christ to free them from their eternall, but not an argument that eternall was not due to them, but a perfect intimation, that it was.

The third place (which is not indeed of much importance in it self, but onely is used to give countenance to the interpretation in the two former places) is 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. the time is come that judgement must begin at the house of God. Here, say they κειμα judgement is that that befalls the house of God, the godly therefore but temporall judgements.

To which I answer in a word, that here is a mistake in opposing judgement in

in its latitude to the house of God, when only it is affirmed by S. *Peter* of the τὸ ἀξασθαι κρίμα, or τὸ πρῶτον, the beginning or first part of judgement: for of the κρίμα or judgement in this verse, there are specified two parts, τὸ πρῶτον, the first part, and τὸ τέλος the end (or else the word τέλος seemes to sound in our English, the tail) of it, as Psal. 75. 8. the cup of Gods displeasure, or punitive justice, is supposed to consist of two parts, 1. red wine (or ἄκρατος) and 2. mixture of Myrrhe and other poysonous bitter spices, called σμύρνα, Apocal. 4. 10. & κολλ. Matth. 24. 17. and both together, οἶνος ἐσμυρνισμένος myrrhate wine, Mark 15. 25. Now this cup is powred out, and tasted of indefinite by the godly some part of it, but the dregs thereof, i. the myrrh bitter part, that goes to the bottome, is left for the wicked to wring out and drinke: so that onely the tolerable, supportable, easie part of the judgement belongs unto the godly, but the end, the dregs, the unsupportable part, to those that obey not the Gospel of God. Or yet a little further, the beginning or first part, τὸ πρῶτον of the judgement, is ἀπ' ἡμῶν, from the godly (and so it was ἀξασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) intimating that the judgement doth not stay upon them, but onely take rise from them; but the τὸ τέλος, the second sadder part of it, is τὸ ἀπειθούντων of them, (or belongs to them) that obey not, &c. So that still in this place also κρίμα signifies Gods judgement of this life and another both; not of this life onely, to the excluding of the other, but one part in this life, another in that other; and though the godly had their part in it, yet there was somewhat in the κρίμα that the godly never tasted of, but only the ἀπειθούντες, they that disobeyed the Gospel of God, and this is apparant by the 18. vers. 18. For if the righteous μόλις σωζεται, we read it scarcely be saved. It signifies (by comparing that place with Prov. 11. 31. where in stead of recompenced on the earth, the Greek translation reads, μόλις σωθήσεται) bee rendred unto, or recompenced, i. punished in the earth, then where shall the ungodly and sinners appeare? There are again the two parts of κρίμα, one ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, Gods retribution to sin here, wherein the godly have their part, and the other his rendring to the wicked hereafter, and so neither of them the punishment of the Magistrate in this life, as Mr. *Bridg.* out of *Piscator*, contends to have it, Rom. 13. and as it must be here also, if others speak pertinently, who use it to avoid that interpretation, which I confesse Mr. Br. doth not.

They that are unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction, yee therefore beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest you also being led away with the error of the wicked fall from your own stedfastnesse, 2 Pet. 3. 16. 17.

FINIS.

63508